

## MXIT'AR (MEKIIITHAR) OF ANI ON THE RISE OF THE SELJUQS

Armenia came under Seljuq attack early in the 5th/11th century<sup>1</sup> and for the next 150 years was partially or fully under Seljuq rule or the rule of their Muslim vassals. Among the sources on the early Seljuqs, the Armenian historians compose a minor, but at times important group, which, while not usually giving new information, help to clarify or at least underline certain points in the Arabic and Persian sources. The utilization of these Armenian works has been made difficult by the lack of critical editions of the major historians<sup>2</sup>, and, therefore, the lack of critical translations for general scholarly use.

Among the Armenian historians the only real account about the early history of the Seljuqs is found in Vardan's *Universal History*, which begins with the Creation and continues to 1267, four years

<sup>1</sup> The Armenian historians place these raids in the first quarter of the century : Matthew of Edessa in 1016 or 1018, *History* (Jerusalem, 1869), p. 57, ed. (Vaharshapat, 1898), p. 46; *Yaysemawurk* (Calendar of the Lives of the Saints) in 1016-17, see H. Dashian, *Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts of the Mekhitarist Library in Vienna* [in Arm.], (Vienna, 1895), p. 100, cf. H. Manandyan, *A Critical Survey of the History of the Armenian People* [in Arm.], Vol. III (Erevan, 1952), p. 33, n. 1; Vardan in 1021, *Universal History* [*Hawak'umn patmuk'ean*], ed. Alişan (Venice, 1862), p. 98. I. Kafesoglu in a recent study affirms that these were led by Seljuq Turks, «*Doğu Anadolu'ya ilk Selçuklu akını (1015-1021) ve tarihî ehemmiyeti*», *Fuad Köprilli Armağanı* (İstanbul, 1953), pp. 259-274, but Claude Cahen in a rejoinder says they were much too early to be led by Seljuqs, «*À propos de quelques articles dans le Köprilli Armağanı*», *J.A.*, CCXLII (1954), pp. 275-9; both authors have relied on available translations of the Armenian sources. Manandyan has excerpted most of these passages in his discussion of the early raids (pp. 31-62), but has categorically rejected Seljuq participation in them, see esp. pp. 37-39. These contradictions in the Armenian sources, later confirmed by the Syriac writer Bar Hebraeus (*Chronography*, trans. E. A. Wallis Budge (London, 1932), p. 195) and Mirkhwând (*Rauqat al-qasâfâ*, Persian text given by Kafesoglu, p. 263, n. 16), have not yet been satisfactorily resolved.

<sup>2</sup> There are now critical editions of Aristakës of Lastivort, *History of Armenia*, ed. K. N. Yuzbaşyan (Erevan, 1963), and of Kirakos Ganjakec'i, *Universal History*, ed. K. A. Melik-Öhanjanyan (Erevan, 1961); however, we still lack such editions of the works of Vardan, Matthew of Edessa, Samuel of Ani, Stephen Orbelian, the anonymous continuation of Thomas Arcruni, the Armenian adaptation of Michael the Syrian, and Mxit'ar of Ayrivank', all of which contain information on the Seljuqs.

before the author's death<sup>3</sup>. This account of the rise of the Seljuqs was first used and translated by M. F. Brosset in his *Histoire de la Géorgie*<sup>4</sup>; it is from this translation that Claude Cahen most recently has had access to Vardan for his studies on Seljuq history up to the battle of Dandānqān in 431/1040<sup>5</sup>. However, despite Brosset's translation, it is not widely known that for this part of his history Vardan utilized almost exclusively a verbatim account from the *History* of the late 6th/12th century Armenian historian Mxit'ar of Ani of which only fragments have come down to us<sup>6</sup>. Almost the whole of section 53 (page 93, line 27 to page 97, line 16) of the Venice edition of Vardan's *History* is an excerpt taken from Mxit'ar. Already one year prior to the Venice edition, M. Emin had published an edition and a Russian translation based on two late manuscripts<sup>7</sup>; Ališan himself used several manuscripts for the Venice edition, the two most important of which date from the 8th/14th century and the 9th/15th century, however, the latter seems to have been copied from an example written in 1265<sup>8</sup> during Vardan's life time. J. Muyldermans, in his critical edition and translation of Vardan's section on the Arab domination of Armenia, has provided an elaborate textual criticism of the manuscript

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Venice, *op. cit.*, pp. 1 and 163; see also H. Oskian, « Vardan Arewelo'i » [in Arm.], *Handes Amsorya* (1921), col. 460.

<sup>4</sup> *Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'en 1469* de J. C. (St. Petersburg, 1851), pp. 220-222. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Mme. Séta Nichanian for transcribing the relevant passage at the Bibliothèque Nationale and for having photocopies made of the necessary passages from the Moscow edition of Vardan's *History*.

<sup>5</sup> Cl. Cahen, « Le Malik-nâmeh et l'histoire des origines seljukides », *Oriens*, II (1949) [henceforth referred to simply as Cahen], pp. 46, 51; *idem*, « À propos... », *op. cit.*, p. 273. Cahen's « Le Malik-nâmeh » is still the fundamental work on Seljuq history before Dandānqān and will serve as the basic reference throughout this paper.

<sup>6</sup> These have been published by K. Patkhanian at the back of his edition of *Sebēos* (St. Petersburg, 1879); unfortunately, this edition has not been accessible for this study. The fragments have been partially summarized with excerpts by G. Zarbhanalean, *Haykakan hin dprut'ean palmut'iwn* (*Literary History of Ancient Armenia*), 2nd ed., Vol. I (Venice, 1897), pp. 723-729; Ališan has also discussed the author and published fragments, *Hayapatum*, 2 vols. (Venice, 1901), I, pp. 100-1, II, pp. 410-2.

<sup>7</sup> Ed. and trans. 2 vols. (Moscow, 1861). One manuscript is undated, but late, and the other an 18th century copy of a 15th century example; see Oskian, *ibid.* The passage under consideration is on pp. 127-131 of the Emin edition.

<sup>8</sup> Ališan, *Vardan*, introd. pp. x-xi; Oskian, *ibid.*; Muyldermans, *La domination arabe en Arménie* (Louvain/Paris, 1927), pp. 28-9.

tradition as well as the two editions<sup>9</sup>. He concludes that the Venice edition, though it utilized better manuscripts, is critically inferior to Emin's and is «insuffisante pour une étude minutieuse et approfondie du texte»<sup>10</sup>. However, after a very close comparison of the passage on the Seljuqs in both editions, it is quite clear that though Ališan's critical apparatus is less rigorous, he understood the text much better than Emin, and, therefore, his text is the preferred one for this study<sup>11</sup>.

The first thirteen lines of Vardan's section 53 (ed. Venice, pp. 93-4) are taken from the work of a certain Vahram<sup>12</sup> which has not come down to us. It is a brief statement on the rise of Sultan Maḥmūd, the Ghaznavid, and after his death the securing of the sultanate by Tughrīl Beg (spelled : *Dawlla-bak*)<sup>13</sup>. The rest of the passage is taken directly from Mxit'ar, and is about equally divided between the history of the Ghaznavids and that of the Seljuqs. The little that we know about the author comes from Vardan, Stephen Orbelian, and the preserved fragments of Mxit'ar's *History on the Armenians, Persians (i.e. Turks), Georgians and Arabs*<sup>14</sup>. According to the writer's

<sup>9</sup> Muyldermans, pp. 7-29, 37-40.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37, see similar remarks on p. 29. Perhaps it should be pointed out that the passage on the Seljuqs was not included in Muyldermans' edition and translation, nor in either the extracts from Vardan in E. Dulaurier, «Les Mongols d'après les historiens arméniens», *JA* (1860), or, *idem*, *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Documents arméniens*, Vol. I (Paris, 1869). Brosset's, «Analyse critique de la Vseobtchaia Istoria de Vardan», *Mém. de l'Acad. imp. des Sc. de St.-Pétersbourg*, Series 7 (1862), Vol. IV, no. 9, a critique of the Emin edition, was not accessible for this study.

<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, both editions will be used here; they are almost identical except for the rendering of names, titles, and foreign words (see the trans. *infra* for the variants) for which Ališan's edition is almost faultless.

<sup>12</sup> According to Vardan he is Vahram, son of Tigran, but the contemporary Mxit'ar Ayirvanec'i says Vahram of Tigranakert, see Ališan's remark, ed. Venice, p. 94, n. 3; see also *idem*, *Hayapatum*, I, p. 92.

<sup>13</sup> This spelling is also encountered in the Armenian adaptation of the *Chronicle* (to 592/1196) of Michael the Syrian, trans. V. Langlois, *Chronique de Michel le Grand* (Venice, 1868), p. 289, in the very same context about Tughrīl and Maḥmūd, and on p. 290 is found the confirming statement, «...Thoughrul-bey ou comme nous l'avons appelé précoédemment [sic] Toglapak d'après certains écrivains». Langlois's system of transliteration is not consistent and the Armenian text of Michael has not been available for checking the exact spelling. Nevertheless, either Michael, who knew Armenian, used Vahram, or they both used a common source.

<sup>14</sup> Vardan, ed. Venice, pp. 91-2, 94, 137-8; Orbelian, trans., M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Siounie* (St. Petersburg, 1864), Vol. I, p. 212, «...l'élegant Histoire de Mkhitar d'Ani»; for excerpts from the published fragments see *supra* n. 6. The work was divided

own testimony his history goes to 589/1193<sup>15</sup>, and this is confirmed by internal evidence in the text<sup>16</sup>.

Mxit'ar says that it was only with much work and the help of God that he found information on the sultans of the Turks<sup>17</sup>. We know from the surviving fragment some of the Armenian sources he used : « ...Lastiverte'i and Kozrann (?), and Samuel »<sup>18</sup>. Furthermore, for the section on the Seljuqs we can safely assume he used Persian sources because he made a translation into Armenian from that language<sup>19</sup>, and because the dating of the passage on the Turks is according to the Islamic era rather than the expected Armenian era<sup>20</sup>.

The sources on early Seljuq history<sup>21</sup> can be separated into three

into three parts. The first, which is preserved in the fragments, is on early Armenian history; the latter lost sections deal with the 10th-12th centuries. There is a 16th century manuscript reportedly containing (part of?) Mxit'ar of Ani's work, but whether it is Patkanian's fragment is not clear; see *C'učak jeragrac' maštoc'i anvan matenadarami*, Vol. I (Erevan, 1965), ms. no. 2678, cols. 851-2.

<sup>15</sup> Zarbhanalean, p. 725.

<sup>16</sup> Tughril b. Arslanshāh (571/1176-590/1194), the last Seljuq sultan of Iraq was still living at the time of Mxit'ar's writing, Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 97, ed. Emin, p. 131; the author tells us the third part of his work ends with the capture of Jerusalem and the coming of the Franks, Zarbhanalean, p. 725, probably a reference to Saladin's capture of the city in 583/1187 and the arrival of the Third Crusade in 585/1189.

<sup>17</sup> Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 94; ed. Emin, p. 127.

<sup>18</sup> Zarbhanalean, p. 727; Aristakēs of Lastivert (d. 1071), *History* (see *supra* n. 2), covering the years from about 390/1000 to 463/1070; Samuel of Ani (6th/12th century), *Chronology* up to 1179 with an anonymous continuation to 1358. As for Kozrann, Կոզրանն, it is probably an error by a later copist for Yovhann[es], Յովհանն[ս] who could then be identified with Yovhannēs Sarkawag of P'arisos (*circa* 442/1050-523/1129), the teacher of Samuel and others (listed by Vardan, ed. Venice, pp. 121-2), who wrote a history reportedly in two parts, the first on the rise of the Turks through Tughril Beg and the second specifically on Malikshāh b. Alp-Arslan (d. 485/1092). We have excerpts from the work preserved in Samuel of Ani which are partially given by Zarbhanalean, pp. 609-611, and Ališan, *Hayapatum*, I, pp. 93-96, II, pp. 336, 358-9, 371, 460. If Kozrann is to be read Yovhann[es], then it would fit well both logically and chronologically in Mxit'ar's list between Aristakēs and Samuel.

<sup>19</sup> A work on eclipses by a certain [V]očiē, who remains unidentified, Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 137; Zarbhanalean, p. 728.

<sup>20</sup> The *hijra* dates 420/1029 and 421/1030 are quoted, Vardan, ed. Venice, pp. 94-5; ed. Emin, p. 128, where the first date is incorrectly read as 440. In the part of Mxit'ar's work dealing with Armenian history the normal Armenian era of dating is used, e.g. Zarbhanalean, pp. 725-6.

<sup>21</sup> For discussions of the sources on Seljuq history see Cl. Cahen, « Le Malik-nâma etc. », *op. cit.*, pp. 31-65; *idem*, « The Historiography of the Seljuqid Period », *Historians*

major groups : Ghaznavid histories, so-called Baghdādī sources which deal with events surrounding the caliphate, and Seljuq histories. The two most important in the first group are the *Zayn al-akhbār*<sup>22</sup> written about 441/1050 by Gardizi and the *Ta'rīkh-i Mas'ūdī*<sup>23</sup> of Bayhaqī (385/995-470/1077), both in Persian. In the second group the most useful are the *Kitāb al-muntaẓam*<sup>24</sup> with events to 573/1177 of Ibn al-Jawzī and the 7th/13th century Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī's *Mir'āt al-zamān*, still unpublished. Finally, the Seljuq histories, though sometimes biased, contain the most details. From the latter group the lost *Maliknāma*, which, according to Cahen, was probably composed for Alp-Arslan before he became sultan (i.e. before 455/1064)<sup>25</sup>, most thoroughly described the origins of the Seljuqs from the time of Duqaq, Seljuq's father, in the 4th/10th century to the battle of Dandānqān in 431/1040. The work was used and specified by Bar Hebraeus in his Syriac *Chronography* (events to 685/1286), in which he says it was written in Persian<sup>26</sup>, and by Mirkhwānd (d. 904/1498)<sup>27</sup>. Furthermore, though not specifically named, the *Maliknāma* was used by 'Imād al-

*of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, 1962), pp. 59-78; *idem*, *Jean Sauvaget's Introduction to the History of the Muslim East, A Bibliographical Guide* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1965), pp. 154-158; V. A. Hamdani, « A Critical Study of the Sources for the History of the Saljuqs of Persia and Syria », dissertation (unpub.), Oxford University (1939); V. V. Barthold, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, 3rd ed. (London, 1968), pp. 20-37; M. Sanaullah, *The Decline of the Saljūqid Empire* (Calcutta, 1938), pp. xix-xxviii; C. E. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids* (Edinburgh, 1963), pp. 7-24; K. A. Luther, « The Political Transformation of the Seljuq Sultanate of Iraq and Western Iran : 1152-1187 », dissertation (unpub.), Princeton Univ. (1964), pp. 276-284; D. Kouymjian, « A Numismatic History of Southeastern Caucasia and Ādharbayjān Based on the Islamic Coinage of the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th Centuries », dissertation (unpub.), Columbia Univ. (1909), pp. 16-46.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. M. Nāzīm (Berlin, 1928).

<sup>23</sup> Ed. Sa'id Nafisi, 3 vols. (Tehran, 1940-53); this is the only part of Bayhaqī's voluminous history which has survived. A résumé in French is to be found in the preface of A. de Biberstein-Kazimirsky's edition of the *Diwān* of Minūchihri (Paris, 1886), pp. 17-131.

<sup>24</sup> Ed. Hyderabad, 5 vols. (1938-41). For a thorough discussion of these Baghdādī sources see Cahen, « Historiography », pp. 60-64.

<sup>25</sup> Cahen, « Le *Malik-nāma* », p. 33, n. 6, where several typographical errors are made, e.g. 1159 and 1163 for 1059 and 1063.

<sup>26</sup> Trans. Budge, p. 195, Turkish trans. Ö. R. Doğrul, Vol. I (Ankara, 1945), p. 292. The author, also known as Gregory Abū'l-Faraj and Ibn 'Ibri, translated his own work into Arabic, *Ta'rīkh mukhtasar al-duwal*, ed. A. Salihani (Beirut, 1890).

<sup>27</sup> *Raudat al-safā'*, (in Persian), 5 vols. (London, 1891-4); see Cahen, p. 38, for a complete discussion of it.

Dīn al-Īsfahānī (519/1125-597/1201) in his Arabic work *Nuṣrat al-fatra*, which in turn was used with acknowledgement by al-Bundārī (7th/13th century) in his *Zubdat al-naṣrāt*<sup>28</sup>. Also the very early 7th/13th century work with the double title *Zubdat al-tawārīkh*, *Akhbār al-dawlat al-Saljūqīyya*<sup>29</sup> used, at least in the earlier *Zubda*, the *Maliknāma*<sup>30</sup>. Finally, Ibn al-Athīr in his *al-Kāmil fī al-ta'rikh*<sup>31</sup> used the *Maliknāma*, without acknowledgement, however, seemingly not from the Persian original, a language he could not read, but probably by way of the same Arabic *Zubda* used by the author of the *Akhbār*<sup>32</sup>. In addition there is a separate tradition, which did not utilize the *Maliknāma*, found in the *Saljūqnāma*<sup>33</sup> of Zāhir al-Dīn Nīshāpūrī, the tutor of Sultan Arslāshāh (555/1160-571/1176), and in turn by al-Rāwandi in his version of the same work found in the *Rāhat al-ṣudūr*<sup>34</sup> composed at the very end of the 6th/12th century.

From the Ghaznavid historians, *Gardīzī* and *Bayhaqī*, the *Maliknāma*, the independent tradition of Zāhir al-Dīn, and random facts from various other sources, a narrative history of the Seljuqs up to the battle of Dandānqān has been pieced together, though still with many difficulties, by Cahen and others<sup>35</sup>. Here only the bare

<sup>28</sup> Ed. M. Th. Houtsma, *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides*, Vol. II (Leiden, 1880), Turkish trans. K. Burslan (Istanbul, 1943). Though Bundārī has weeded out the excess of superfluous material in 'Imād al-Dīn, he has « scrupulously preserved all the hard facts », Cahen, « Historiography », p. 68, n. 44.

<sup>29</sup> Attributed by M. Iqbāl to 'Ali Ibn Nāṣir al-Husaynī, ed. Iqbāl (Lahore, 1933); Turkish trans. N. Lügal (Ankara, 1943).

<sup>30</sup> For a detailed discussion, Cahen, « Historiography », p. 70.

<sup>31</sup> Ed. C. J. Tornberg, 14 vols. (Leiden/Uppsala, 1851-76), reprint in 13 vols. (Beirut, 1967).

<sup>32</sup> For a full discussion, Cahen, *ibid.*, pp. 70-72.

<sup>33</sup> Ed. G. Khāwār (Tehran, 1953), which was not accessible for this study. Cahen has dramatically underlined their separateness saying, « we have the impression that Zāhir al-Dīn and his epigones knew nothing of the Arabic group of sources, even the Iranian ones [i.e. those written in Arabic by Persians] and that, in short, there are two families of histories, each ignorant of the other, separated by a cleavage of language »; *ibid.*, p. 75.

<sup>34</sup> Ed. M. Iqbāl, *Gibb Memorial Series*, New Series, II (London, 1921); Turkish trans. A. Ateş, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1957-60). The original of the *Saljūqnāma* is much superior to Rāwandi's version, Cahen, *ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>35</sup> Cahen, « Le Malik-nāma », pp. 41-55; *idem*, « The Turkish Invasion : the Selchūkids », *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton, Vol. I (Philadelphia, 1958), pp. 139-142; *idem*, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, trans. J. Jones-Williams (London, 1968), pp. 19-23; Barthold,

outline of the narrative will be presented as a prelude to the events (beginning only in 416/1025) discussed by Mxit'ar of Ani.

The Seljuqs emerged as a sub-group, perhaps only a family, of the Qiniq tribe of the Oghuz Turkic confederation which by the 4th/10th century had settled in the steppe area of the lower Syr Darya (Jaxartes) River, northeast of the Aral Sea. Ibn Fadlān<sup>36</sup>, the caliphal ambassador who passed through this area in 309-10/921-2 on his way from Baghdād to the Qaghan of the Volga Bulgars, reported that the Oghuz Turks were living as pagan nomads in wretched and uncivilized conditions and that their leader was called the Yabghū, a title which is encountered at least as early as the 8th century Orkhon Valley inscriptions of the Kōk Turkic (Tiu-Kiu) Empire<sup>37</sup>. The Yabghū was second only to the Qaghan, the King, in this empire<sup>38</sup>. After the breakup of this vast Turkic confederation in the same 8th century the Oghuz kept the title Yabghū and henceforth used it to designate the leader of their own confederation.

In the latter 4th/10th century Seljuq b. Duqaq, like his father, had become the military chief, *sü-bashi*, of the Oghuz Yabghū, whose winter residence was in Yengi-Kent on the lower Syr Darya<sup>39</sup>. After a falling out with the Oghuz Yabghū, Seljuq left Yengi-Kent for the area around Jand, still on the lower Syr Darya, but in the Islamic

*Turkestan*, pp. 256-304 *passim*; *idem*, «A History of the Turkman People», in *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, trans. V. and T. Minorsky, Vol. III (Leiden, 1962), pp. 91-108; O. Pritsak, «Der Untergang des Reiches des oguzischen Yabgu», *Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*, *op. cit.*, pp. 405-8; C. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids*, pp. 210-226; *idem*, *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. V, *The Seljuq and Mongol Periods* (Cambridge, 1968) [henceforth *CHI*], pp. 16-23; F. Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler) Tarihleri — boy teşkilatı — destanları* (Ankara, 1967), pp. 60-90; I. Kafesoğlu, article «Selçuklular», *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. X (İstanbul, 1966), pp. 353-362.

<sup>36</sup> *Risāla*, ed. and trans. A. Z. V. Togan, *Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht, Abhand. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XXIV, no. 3 (Leipzig, 1938-9), trans. pp. 19-27, text pp. 10-14; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, pp. 216-7.

<sup>37</sup> On the title see Togan, pp. 140-1; Pritsak, *op. cit.*, p. 403. For its pro-Kōk Turkic origin and etymology see now Karl H. Menges, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples* (Wiesbaden, 1968), p. 88.

<sup>38</sup> Somewhat later in the 5th/11th century Mahmūd of Kāshghar says that *yabghū* was a title two degrees lower than *qaghan*, *Diwān lughat al-turk*, ed. Kilişli Rif'at Bey (İstanbul, 1917), Vol. III, p. 24, cf. V. Minorsky, *Hudūd al-Ālam* (London, 1937), p. 288.

<sup>39</sup> On the history of the Oghuz Yabghū see Pritsak, *op. cit.*; S. P. Tolstov, *Po sledam drevnekhorezmiščok tsvivilizatsii* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1948), German trans. (Berlin, 1953); Sümer, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-59.

area of Transoxiana, where, about the same time, *circa* 382/992, he converted to Islam<sup>40</sup>. At the request of the Sāmānids he sent his son Arslan-Isrā'il to help fight against the Qarakhānid, Hārūn Boghra Khān, who captured Bukhārā in that same year<sup>41</sup>. Now settled in the area of Bukhārā, Arslan-Isrā'il, after the fall of the Sāmānids, served their rivals the Qarakhānids.

The narrative now becomes less clear. In 393/1003 Gārdīzī reports that Yabghū<sup>42</sup>, the leader of the Oghuz, rendered assistance to the last Sāmānid ruler, Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'il, in his struggle against the Qarakhānid Ilīg Khān Naṣr and on the same occasion the Oghuz leader converted to Islam. Barthold, and more recently Cahen, hold that the Yabghū referred to in the passage is Arslan-Isrā'il who had taken the title in defiance and opposition to the Oghuz Yabghū some time after the Seljuqs had left Yengi-Kent<sup>43</sup>. Pritsak and Bosworth after him maintain that it is the Oghuz Yabghū who is meant and that, furthermore, it would be too early for a Seljuq to have assumed the title Yabghū<sup>44</sup>. There is evidence to make a case for either side<sup>45</sup> and the debate is not yet resolved. Though no direct

<sup>40</sup> Cahen, p. 43; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 220; Pritsak, p. 407.

<sup>41</sup> Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 259. For details on the complicated Qarakhānid rulers see now the following works of Pritsak: « Karachanidische Streitfragen 1-4 », *Oriens*, III (1950), pp. 209-228; « Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden », *ZDMG*, CI (1951), pp. 270-300; article « Kara-Hanlılar », *İslām Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 6 (1955), pp. 251-273, German version, « Die Karachaniden », *Der Islam*, XXXI (1953-4), pp. 17-68.

<sup>42</sup> Gārdīzī, ed. Nāzīm, p. 64. Almost consistently throughout the Islamic sources and in this instance, the form is بیغۇ, *bīghū* or *payghū*, which J. Marquart equated with *yabghū*, « Über das Volkstum der Komanen », *Abhand. der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissen.* (Göttingen, 1914), N.F., 13 no. 1, pp. 42-3; however, P. Pelliot, « Notes sur le 'Turkestan' de M. W. Barthold », *T'oung-Pao*, XXVII (1930), p. 16, and more recently Pritsak, « Der Untergang », *op. cit.*, pp. 406-7, have suggested that in some cases rather than the title *yabghū*, it may be simply the totemistic name *Bighu*, « falcon », like other such Seljuq names *Tughrl* and *Chaghrl*.

<sup>43</sup> Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 269; Cahen, p. 44; *idem*, « À propos », *op. cit.*, pp. 272-3, this latter in direct reply to Pritsak *infra* n. 44.

<sup>44</sup> Pritsak, « Der Untergang », pp. 406-7; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, pp. 221-222; and by implication, *idem*, *CHI*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>45</sup> Both the Oghuz Yabghū and Arslan-Isrā'il can be shown to have had Sāmānid alliances at this time; Pritsak, p. 406-7, and Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 222; Cahen, p. 44. The main question is: did Arslan-Isrā'il take the title Yabghū as early as 393/1003? Recently Sümer, *Oğuzlar*, *op. cit.*, pp. 58 and 62, without bringing any new sources to light, has concluded that Arslan-Isrā'il bore the title of Yabghū as early as 392/1002, but he is not convincing.

information on this incident is found in the Armenian sources, Cahen on two occasions has called on the testimony of Vardan<sup>46</sup>, i.e. Mxit'ar, to independently underline the association of the title Yabghū with Arslan-Isrā'il. Indeed, as will be shown below, Mxit'ar does affirm this relationship, but, as Cahen himself has said<sup>47</sup>, it is in the context of events more than two decades after Gardizi's report, and, therefore, not really helpful in telling us who the Yabghū of 393/1003 was.

Presumably shortly after this, we are told in a unique account in Ibn al-Athīr<sup>48</sup> that Chaghri Beg and Tughril Beg, the sons of Mikā'il b. Seljuq (who died shortly after the family moved to Jand), fought for a certain Qarakhānid ruler called Boghra Khān who is still not clearly identified<sup>49</sup>; later they left him to join their uncle Arslan-Isrā'il to fight for a rival Qarakhānid, 'Ali-Tegin of Bukhārā and Samarqand<sup>50</sup>. In 416/1025 Sultan Maḥmūd the Ghaznavid in alliance with the Qarakhānid Qadir Khān Yūsuf moved against 'Ali-Tegin (Qadir's brother) and his Seljuq allies<sup>51</sup>.

Here Mxit'ar of Ani's account of the rise of the Seljuqs begins. After presenting a short outline history of the Ghaznavids through the death of Maḥmūd and the seizing of the sultanate by his son Mas'ūd<sup>52</sup>, Mxit'ar continues thus :

And whereas his [i.e. Mas'ūd's] father [i.e. Maḥmūd], going to the aid of that nation, whose leader was called Qadir Khān-Boghra Khān (*Xrlan-Pawlān*), meets, on the way, troops of a certain multitude of Turks<sup>53</sup>, and in returning by the same way, seized their *amīr* Yabghū (*zAp'alu*), takes [him] to Khurāsān (*Xorasan*) and puts [him] in captivity ('i *kapans*, « in bonds »);

<sup>46</sup> Cahen, p. 46, n. 39; « À propos », p. 273; both via Brosset, *Additions, op. cit.*, pp. 222, where the spelling Apaghon [sic, not Apagon] is given for the Armenian *Ap'alu* (see *infra*).

<sup>47</sup> « À propos », *ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *al-Kāmil*, IX, p. 323, Beirut reprint, IX, p. 474; Cahen, p. 48.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*; he was called the *amīr* of Bukhārā. Bosworth, *CHI*, p. 18, has recently suggested Yīghan-Tegin b. Qadir Khān Yūsuf, the Qarakhānid ruler of Talas and Isfījāb; see *infra* for a further discussion.

<sup>50</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, *ibid.*; Cahen, pp. 48-49; Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 280; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 223; *idem*, *CHI*, p. 18.

<sup>51</sup> A very full account of the alliance and subsequent events, mostly taken from Gardizi, is given by Barthold, *ibid.*, pp. 282-285; Cahen, pp. 51-2.

<sup>52</sup> Ed. Venice, p. 94, line 9 to p. 95, line 25; ed. Emin, p. 127 to p. 129, line 5.

<sup>53</sup> Brosset, *op. cit.*, p. 221, « une multitude de Turks », the Armenian, « *banakac'* inδ' *bazmud'ean T'urk'ac'* ».

and his people having come, begged [for his release] from the father [i.e. Mahmūd], and afterwards (*apa*) from the son<sup>54</sup> [i.e. Mas'ūd], [but] neither gave (*ew oč' etun*) [him up]. As for them [the Turks], angered, they passed across the Oxus (*Jahun*) [River] with all their troops, and putting themselves before death, they fought and won and seized Nishāpūr (*Nšawur*); and [afterwards] they destroyed the armies of the sultan at Dandānqān (*Dadan-lan*)<sup>55</sup> near Marv (*Mrmn*); and the sultan becoming [a] fugitive, goes to Ghazna (*Lazin*) and from there to India (*Hndiks*, « the Indies »). And on the way the sultan was killed, and they enthroned his blind brother in Ghazna (*Lazuin*), who by remaining [there], begat sons, and one after the other taking [the throne], they hold Ghazna (*Lazuin*)<sup>56</sup> until today.

As for the leader (*yarajadēm*) of the Turks<sup>57</sup>, whose name was Mūsā Yabghū (*Musēap'alu*) the son of Seljuq (*Sarč'uk'ay ordi*)<sup>58</sup>, he had five nephews, whose names [were] : Abū Salim (*Abusalim*)<sup>59</sup>, Dā'ūd (*Dawut'*), Chaghri Beg (*Č'albek*), Abū Tālib (*Abutalip'*)<sup>60</sup>, Tughril Beg (*Tawlil-Bekn*)<sup>61</sup>; [it was Tughril] who received the authority of the sultanate, and [for] fifteen years extended [his] realm, dividing up all the land of Khurāsān (*Xorasan*); and coming to Ray (*yRē*) he finds two stores of treasure filled with gold, and seizes [them] and sends [them ?]<sup>62</sup> to the

<sup>54</sup> Ed. Emin, « sons ».

<sup>55</sup> Ed. Emin, *Dadalan*.

<sup>56</sup> Ed. Emin, *Lazvin*, *Xazvin*, *Xazvin* respectively. There is some confusion on the part of Ališan and Emin as well as in the manuscript tradition between the cities of Qazwin and Ghazna. Earlier in the text *Lazuin* (Qazwin) in conjunction with *Rē* (Ray) is clear, ed. Venice, p. 95; Ališan understood it that way too, giving in n. 6 the following variants : *Xazuin*, *Gazpin*. However, on p. 96 he makes no comment on the name *'i Lazinn*, *'i Lazuin*, *zLazuin*, which in the context can only apply to Ghazna, the Ghaznavid capital. It is difficult to determine whether Ališan misunderstood Qazwin for Ghazna in the latter situation, because on p. 96, n. 3 he refers to the Ghaznavids (*zLazneweanc'n*); Emin most certainly mistook Qazwin for Ghazna.

<sup>57</sup> *Yarajadēm* has the meaning « advanced », « forward », « progressive », and *yarajadēm-n*, « the one who goes forward », hence, in this context « the leader ». Brosset, *Additions*, p. 222, translates : « Mais un chef turc, nommé Mouseph, fils d'Aghou-Sarichouk ». He has obviously completely mis-read the name Mūsā Yabghū (*Musēap'lu*); it is probably because of the mistake on Brosset's part that Cahen did not make mention of this clear reference to Mūsā Yabghū.

<sup>58</sup> Ed. Venice, *Museap'aloj Sarč'uk'ay ordi*.

<sup>59</sup> Emin, *Abusalim*.

<sup>60</sup> Emin, *Abutalik'*.

<sup>61</sup> Emin, *Tulril pēk*.

<sup>62</sup> The sentence is ambiguous; one is not sure if Mxit'ar meant he sent the treasure or just sent word to the caliph.

caliph (*xalip'ayn*)<sup>63</sup> and asks [his] blessing; and he [i.e. the caliph] honors him by means of ambassadors (*arambk'* *patuwakanawk'*, « by honorable men »), and gives him an insignia (*alam*, Arabic *'alam*) [of office] and presents, and reads his name in the *khuṭba* (*'i mambarn*<sup>64</sup>, Arabic *minbar*, i.e. in the pulpit) and gives him the name Rukn al-Dawla (*Ruk'nadawla*)<sup>65</sup>; and from that day he was proclaimed conqueror<sup>66</sup>.

The beginning of Mxit'ar's passage flashes back to Mahmūd after having mentioned his death and the succession of Mas'ūd in the previous sentence, perhaps indicating here the use of a different source. As mentioned above, in 416/1025 Mahmūd moved north across the Oxus and had a meeting with Qadir Khān Yūsuf b. Hārūn Boghra Khān, forming an alliance against 'Ali-Tegin and his Seljuq allies<sup>67</sup>. The identity of Qadir Khān is well established, but what did Mxit'ar mean by Qadirkhān-Boghrakhān? Brosset translated the passage as though two people were involved, « dont les chefs se nommaient Khter-Khan et Bokhr-Khan »<sup>68</sup>, taking liberties with the text which has a singular subject and verb. Perhaps Mxit'ar thought that Qadir also had the title Boghra Khān like his father Hārūn and his son Yighan-Tegin, but this is seemingly not confirmed by other sources. Most probably « son of » was dropped out of the text, perhaps even by Mxit'ar, and should be restored to give the reading Qadir Khān b. Boghra Khān<sup>69</sup>.

<sup>63</sup> Emin, *xalifayn*.

<sup>64</sup> Emin, *Imambar*, making the same mistake as Brosset, p. 222, « et lui conféra le titre d'Imambar ».

<sup>65</sup> Emin, *Duk'nat ala*, again similar to Brosset's misreading, « avec le surnom de Doukhar-Agha ».

<sup>66</sup> Citation for the full passage, Vardan, ed. Venice, p. 95, line 21 to p. 96, line 23; ed. Emin, p. 129, line 5 to p. 130, line 10; French trans., Brosset, pp. 221-2. The Russian translation of Emin has not been available nor a Turkish translation by Hrant D. Andreyasyan, *Türk fütuhat tarihi*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Semineri Dergisi, 1/2 (İstanbul, 1937). Currently, a critical text and translation of Mxit'ar's entire passage on the Ghaznavids and Seljuqs is being prepared by the author.

<sup>67</sup> See *supra*, n. 51. Barthold interprets the events as though Mahmūd invaded Transoxiana in that year, and while there concluded his alliance with Qadir Khān. This could mean that only later, perhaps in the next year, 417/1026, Mahmūd, honoring the alliance, went to the help of Qadir. This may be the logic behind Bosworth's most recent placing of the subsequent defeat of 'Ali-Tegin and capture of Arslan-Isrā'il (see *infra*) in 417/1026, *CHI*, p. 18.

<sup>68</sup> *Additions*, p. 221.

<sup>69</sup> Of course if Qadir had the title Boghra Khān or was very closely united with the

According to Gardīzī, in the face of the alliance between Qadīr Khān and Maḥmūd, 'Alī-Tegin fled abandoning Bukhārā and Samārquand. Then Maḥmūd, having learned that Isrā'il had taken cover in a certain place, sent men to arrest him and took him to Ghazna and finally to India <sup>70</sup>; from Rāwandi we learn that it was in the fortress of Kalinjar in India where he was kept imprisoned for seven years <sup>71</sup>. Ibn al-Āthīr, on the other hand, says that Maḥmūd only captured Arslan-Isrā'il by treachery, inviting him as an unsuspecting guest and then seizing him <sup>72</sup>. Bosworth is of the impression that the Seljuq was captured some time after the defeat of 'Alī-Tegin <sup>73</sup>. Cahen has most recently interpreted the events thus: « As a result of the defeat, Arslan-Isrā'il agreed to move with his men to Khorasan, where Mahmūd wished him to settle and where his services could be relied upon, out of the reach of 'Alī-Tegin »; only later was Isrā'il taken as a hostage to India <sup>74</sup>. Mxit'ar's account is very specific: on the way back from helping Qadīr Khān he seized Yabghū (Isrā'il) after a great victory. One would presume that this was after the alliance with Qadīr for he was going to his aid; therefore, the capture of Arslan-Isrā'il could date from 417/1026 as Bosworth has suggested (*supra* n. 67).

We have already commented on the identity of Mxit'ar's Ap'alu/Yabghū (*supra* p. 338). Though Gardīzī calls him Isrā'il son of Seljuq, and Ibn al-Āthīr says Arslan, the *Akhbār al-dawlat al-Saljūqiyya* confirms the identification by saying it was Arslan Yabghū called Isrā'il <sup>75</sup>. Then, according to our author, the Yabghū's people begged Maḥmūd for their leader's release and later Mas'ūd; 'Imād al-Dīn

activities of his son Yīghān-Tegin Boghra Khān, we may be able to identify the mysterious Boghra Khān of Ibn al-Āthīr with whom Tughril and Chaghri had close relations with Qadīr Khān or perhaps Yīghān-Tegin as Bosworth has suggested, see *supra* n. 49. For a further discussion of the question, Cahen, p. 48.

<sup>70</sup> As cited by Barthold, *A History of the Turkmen People*, *op. cit.*, p. 103, and *Turkestan*, p. 285.

<sup>71</sup> Ed. Iqbāl, pp. 90-91 and 103; Turkish trans., pp. 88-89 and 101. On Kalinjar see the additional references in the notes at the end of the trans., pp. 437-8.

<sup>72</sup> Ibn al-Āthīr, IX, p. 323, reprint IX, pp. 475-6; Barthold, p. 285, n. 1.

<sup>73</sup> *Ghaznavids*, p. 224; *CHI*, p. 19.

<sup>74</sup> *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 20-21; see also « Le Malik-nāma », p. 52.

<sup>75</sup> Gardīzī, p. 64; Ibn al-Āthīr, reprint IX, p. 475; *Akhbār*, trans., pp. 2 and 3. Bayhaqī and Nishāpūrī also refer to him as Isrā'il, while Iṣfahānī like Ibn al-Āthīr calls him Arslan; Cahen, p. 45.

al-İsfahānī concurs on this point <sup>76</sup>. It is not improbable to assume that the appeal to Mas'ūd was made after he became sultan, that is after late 421/1030; this would fit in well with Rāwandi's testimony, being roughly the fourth year of Isrā'il's seven year captivity.

The *Maliknāma* and *Gardizi* do not refer to these appeals, but rather say that the followers of Arslan-Isrā'il resettled, either voluntarily <sup>77</sup> or by force <sup>78</sup>, in Khurāsān near the town of Abiward, Farāwa and Sarakhs. Later they left this area for Iran <sup>79</sup>. However, in 426/1035 Yabghū (= Mūsā b. Seljuq, see *infra*), Tughril and Chaghri, who had stayed in the Bukhārā area after the events of 416/1025-417/1026 <sup>80</sup> until the death of 'Ali-Tegin in 425/1034, moved to Khwārazm, but shortly after asked Mas'ūd to be allowed to move into the lands around Farāwa and Nasā previously abandoned by Isrā'il's followers <sup>81</sup>. Though they were refused, they moved into this area without permission. Confronted by this *fait accompli*, Mas'ūd sent them individually patents of office with the titles of *dihqān* for the cities Farāwa, Nasā, and Dehistān respectively for (Mūsā) Yabghū, Tughril and Chaghri <sup>82</sup>.

Mxit'ar does not mention any of the above details, but says only that the Turks, angered that Arslan Yabghū was not released, moved across the Oxus into Khurāsān and fought against Mas'ūd with *all* their troops, probably meaning here not just the followers of Arslan-Isrā'il, but also those of (Mūsā) Yabghū, Tughril and Chaghri. Marv finally capitulated to the Seljuqs in 428/1037 followed by Herāt and Nishāpūr in 429/1038, this latter event mentioned by Mxit'ar,

<sup>76</sup> Ed. Houtsma, p. 6; trans. p. 3. However, according to 'Imād al-Dīn it was Mas'ūd who sent troops to capture Arslan, but the time is not specified.

<sup>77</sup> *Gardizi*, cf. Cahen, p. 52, n. 53.

<sup>78</sup> 'Imād al-Dīn and the *Akhbār*, cf. *ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> Leaderless, these Seljuqs pillaged the towns of Iran and Armenia before they were finally scattered and disappeared. They were known to Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Athīr as the « Iraqi Türkmen »; for details see Cahen, pp. 56-57; *idem*, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 21; *idem*, *History of the Crusades*, *op. cit.*, p. 140; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 225; *idem*, *CHI*, p. 19.

<sup>80</sup> We are not sure if these three actually fought with Arslan-Isrā'il against Maḥmūd; Cahen, p. 52.

<sup>81</sup> Bayhaqī, pp. 470-1, cf. Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 225; Cahen, pp. 57, 59; *idem*, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 21.

<sup>82</sup> Cahen, p. 59, with references to Bayhaqī, *Gardizi*, and the *Maliknāma*; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 242; *idem*, *CHI*, p. 20.

but without a date<sup>83</sup>. Mas'ūd, now finally realizing the Seljuq threat to his hold on Khurāsān, personally led an army against them. The sultan suffered a disastrous defeat in which his army was destroyed at Dandānqān about forty miles from Marv<sup>84</sup>. Khurāsān was completely given up to the Seljuqs.

Mxit'ar moves swiftly from the capture of Arslan Yabghū to the taking of Nishāpūr and the battle of Dandānqān. He does not mention a single Seljuq by name; his concern is with the Ghaznavids, probably indicating the use of an essentially Ghaznavid source for this part of his text. The facts about Mas'ūd's flight and death and the succession of his blind brother Muḥammad<sup>85</sup>, are all basically correct. He is not aware that Muḥammad's second sultanate was as short lived as his first, nor that he was succeeded in the next year 433/1042 by Mas'ūd's son Maudūd. The future rulers of Ghazna were in fact not the sons of the blind Muḥammad as Mxit'ar has it, but those of Mas'ūd.

Whatever source Mxit'ar used, Ghazna was still in the hands of these sons (i.e. of Mas'ūd) when it was written. We know that already by 543/1148 the Ghaznavid Sultan Bahrāmshāh was forced to leave his capital for a whole year while it was occupied by the Ghūrids. Shortly after in 545/1150-1, Ghazna was subject to a bloody sack and severe destruction again by the Ghūrids. In *circa* 550/1155 Sultan Khusrawshāh finally abandoned the city for the Punjab taking Lahore as his capital<sup>86</sup>. Thus Mxit'ar's source for this passage was written at least before *circa* 550/1155, and, furthermore, since there is mention of neither the Ghūrids nor other trouble in Ghazna, prob-

<sup>83</sup> The fullest account is in Bayhaqī, pp. 550-4, which has been translated in its entirety by Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, pp. 252-7. See also his *CHI*, p. 20; Cahen, pp. 60 ff.; *idem*, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 22.

<sup>84</sup> It was to the north of the city between Marv and Sarakhs, Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 303, n. 1; Cahen, p. 64; Bosworth, *CHI*, p. 22.

<sup>85</sup> In the earlier section on the Ghaznavids, Mxit'ar had already discussed Muḥammad's succession to the sultanate upon his father's death and his being blinded shortly afterward by his brother Mas'ūd; ed. Venice, p. 95.

<sup>86</sup> For details on these events see Bosworth, *CHI*, pp. 160-1; S. Lane-Poole, *Muhammadan Dynasties*, reprint (Paris, 1925), pp. 288-292; E. de Zambaur, *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie* (Hanover, 1927), pp. 280-4; Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 338. Ghazna was actually occupied by Oghuz Turks from Khurāsān for more than a decade; it was only in 569/1173-4 that the Ghūrids definitively occupied the city.

ably before 542/1148. If the text is taken literally, that is if a son of Mas'ūd was actually ruling when it was written, then, since his last son Ibrāhīm ruled until 492/1099, a late 5th/11th century source was used by Mxit'ar.

Only after he has done with the Ghaznavids does our author finally introduce the Seljuqs by name. He has most likely changed his source once again, seemingly relying on primarily Seljuq histories for the remainder of his account. Therefore, though the battle of Dandānqān was alluded to in the previous passage, there is no reason to assume that this new section, which begins with the statement that Mūsā Yabghū (now clearly identified) was the leader of the Turks, necessarily refers to the post-Dandānqān period. As we have already seen a certain « Yabghū », in association with Tughril Beg and Chaghri Beg, is mentioned in the sources during the half decade or so before the battle.

Once again, just as with Gardizi's account of 393/1003 (see *supra* p. 338), the identity of the present Yabghū has been put in question. If the title is to be associated with the senior member of the family<sup>87</sup>, then after the death of Arslan-Isrā'il *circa* 423-4/1032-3 (i.e. after seven years of captivity, see *supra* p. 342), or perhaps even while he was still a prisoner, it should have passed to Mūsā the only remaining son of Seljuq. However, according to Ibn al-Athir, the Qarakhanid 'Ali-Tegin gave the title of īnanch Yabghū to Yūsuf, Mūsā's son; shortly after 'Ali-Tegin had Yūsuf killed when the Seljuqs rebelled against 'Ali<sup>88</sup>. Since 'Ali-Tegin himself died in 425/1034<sup>89</sup>, Yūsuf's tenure as īnanch Yabghū did not last long. In the following year Yabghū, Tughril and Chaghri made their way to Khurāsān and, henceforth, the three names appear together again and again in the sources.

Bayhaqī refers to Yabghū as the uncle of Tughril and Chaghri; the *Maliknāma* speaks of an anonymous uncle; Ibn al-Athir wrongly

<sup>87</sup> See *supra* pp. 10-11. Cahen emphasizes the point : « Il n'est pas douteux qu'il [Yabghū] était le chef théorique de la famille.... Sans doute était-il leur ainé. Le titre de Beg, porté par Tughril et Chaghri, a un sens varié, mais en général, rendu en arabe par 'amīr', doit signifier un chef autonome de groupe, mais non la direction de la famille ou de la tribu au complet »; Cahen, pp. 53-4, see also p. 46.

<sup>88</sup> Ibn al-Athir, reprint Beirut, IX, p. 476; Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 297; Cahen, p. 53; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 244, n. 9.

<sup>89</sup> Barthold, p. 298; Cahen, p. 53; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 241; *idem*, *CHI*, p. 19.

considers him as the brother of Tughril and Chaghri<sup>90</sup>. However, Nishāpūrī and after him al-Rāwandi call Mūsā « Yabghū » and, even more, refer to him as Mūsā *kalān* (in Persian « the eldest » or « of great importance »)<sup>91</sup>. Yet Rāzī and Iṣfahānī by implication consider Ḥasan, another son of Mūsā, as the Yabghū<sup>92</sup>. Cahen, after reviewing all this diverse testimony, says, « je m'avoue toutefois incapable de trancher le débat »<sup>93</sup>. Bosworth in *The Ghaznavids* underlined the problem by referring to Cahen's statement<sup>94</sup>; however, more recently, but without references to new information or hypotheses, he accepts, with neither doubt nor hesitation, the identity of Mūsā and only Mūsā with Yabghū throughout this period<sup>95</sup>.

Mxit'ar firmly confirms the identity of Mūsā, uncle of Tughril and Chaghri, as the Yabghū, and, furthermore, explicitly says that he is the leader of the Turks. Therefore, in the general, perhaps vague, context of Mxit'ar's statement, it can be said that at least from 425/1034, and more likely as early as the captivity or certainly the death of Arslan-Isrā'il, Mūsā had the title of Yabghū. As for the question of Yūsuf b. Mūsā as Yabghū, there are some problems. Yet, since he is referred to as Ḥananch Yabghū rather than just Yabghū, is it not possible he could have received that title while his father was still considered as the Yabghū<sup>96</sup>? Furthermore, if the title is still to designate the senior member of the family, even if only honorarily, surely it is the Seljuq family itself which recognizes or bestows this honor. It seems strange that an outsider, the Qarakhānid 'Ali-Tegin, should decide whom among the Seljuqs should have this rank. Therefore, in light of this and Mxit'ar's unequivocal statement, Mūsā may be considered as the Seljuq Yabghū, at least from the death of

<sup>90</sup> For full references, Cahen, p. 54, n. 56.

<sup>91</sup> Ed. Iqbāl, pp. 102 and 104; trans. pp. 101 and 102, where the meaning seems to be misunderstood.

<sup>92</sup> For reference to Fakhr al-Din Rāzī (late 6th/12th century) see Cahen, pp. 39 and 54, n. 56; 'Imād al-Dīn, ed. Houtsma, p. 8.

<sup>93</sup> Cahen, p. 54.

<sup>94</sup> « There are, however, many contradictions in the sources, and Cahen frankly avows he is unable to resolve them »; pp. 225-6.

<sup>95</sup> *CHI*, pp. 19, 20, 22, 49-51.

<sup>96</sup> Ḥananch still has the meaning in modern Turkish of « trusted », « believed in », « confided in » and would serve well as an adjective for Yūsuf in his relation to 'Ali-Tegin.

Arslan Yabghū until his own death some time after 456/1064<sup>97</sup>. However, it must be emphasized that by Mxit'ar's subsequent testimony, which is in agreement with all the other sources, Tughril Beg was the actual dynamic leader of the family during this period<sup>98</sup>. It may be conjectured that because of the anomaly of Mūsā as the Yabghū, but without supreme authority over the Seljuq family, the title became strictly honorary during Mūsā's incumbency. It is interesting that subsequently neither Alp-Arslan, Malikshāh, nor any of their successors from the main ruling branch of the family took this title; now they were « Sultans » of the universal *sunnī* Islamic state, no longer needing or coveting titles from their Turkic, Central Asiatic, and nomadic past.

Another point which merits discussion is the use by Mxit'ar of Ani of the form *Sarč'uk'* for Seljuq<sup>99</sup>. It is a form well attested in the Armenian sources. Yovhannēs Sarkawag (John the Deacon) used *Sarč'uk* in the fragment of his lost history on the Turks quoted by Samuel of Ani (*supra* n. 18); Kirakos of Ganjak, also citing Yovhannēs and Samuel, uses the same form<sup>100</sup>. The spelling is rare in Islamic sources, but is found in at least one work, the Arabic *Risāla, Tafsīl al-Atrāk 'alā sā'ir al-ajnād*<sup>101</sup>, by Abū'l 'Alā b. Hassūl (d. 450/1058), who was an important administrator of the Ghaznavids and later the Seljuqs in Ray. Besides this work written for Tughril Beg, he may have composed a history in the form of a chronology on the early Seljuqs. Cahen, after discussing the author and his work in great detail, says that Abū'l 'Alā has affinities to the Nishāpūrī group of

<sup>97</sup> For Mūsā's activities after 431/1040 see Bosworth, *CHI*, pp. 49-51. The precise date of his death is seemingly uncertain, see Kafesoglu, « Selçuklular », *op. cit.*, pp. 356 and 363; he may have still been alive in 458/1065-6, Cahen, p. 33.

<sup>98</sup> The relative lack of detailed information on Mūsā and even Chaghri in comparison to Tughril has led Cahen to regard Chaghri as colorless and politically passive, see the article « Chaghri-Beg », *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., and more recently to regard Mūsā as « far from dynamic », *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 20.

<sup>99</sup> The usual form in Islamic sources is *Saljūq*; see the references and discussion in Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 219, n. 44, with a further statement by Menges on the problem of pronunciation and spelling in *The Turkic Languages*, *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 37), p. 26.

<sup>100</sup> Ed. K. A. Melik-Öhanjanyan (Erevan, 1961), p. 84, especially the variants listed under the text.

<sup>101</sup> Ed. 'Abbās 'Azzāwī, with Turkish trans. by S. Yaltkaya, *Bulleten*, IV (1940), 51 pages of text, trans. pp. 250-266.

historians, i.e. al-Rāwandi, Rashid al-Dīn (a section on the Seljuqs in his *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*) and Mirkhwānd (only for the post-Dandānqān period); he concludes, « Qu'Abū'l-'Alā ait ou non composé un ouvrage sur les origines seljukides, il me paraît exclu en tous cas qu'aucun ouvrage de ce genre ait pu être utilisé par les auteurs du groupe de Zahīr ad-dīn »<sup>102</sup>. However, the use of the form *Sarč'uk'* / *Sarč'uk* by Mxit'ar and earlier Yovhannēs, which must be more than just an orthographic error since it is so well attested, is so striking in relation to Abū'l 'Alā's form *S.r.j.q.*<sup>103</sup>, that the possible relationship between the Armenian sources and Ibn Ḥassūl must be examined more closely (for which see *infra*).

Mūsā Yabghū is reported by Mxit'ar to have had five nephews, but in reality the author only gives the names of Chaghri and Tughril, the sons of Mikā'il b. Seljuq, but in a fuller form : Abū Salim [sic, read Suleimān] Dā'ūd Chaghri Beg and Abū Tālib Tughril Beg. Whether it was a later copyist, who, perhaps seeing five names, changed the word « two » to « five » or maybe just added « five », or if Mxit'ar himself misunderstood the text he was using, is not clear. In the same sentence, which is not very clearly constructed for classical Armenian, the narrative shifts to Tughril Beg after a « who » (Arm. « or ») which would normally refer to the subject of the earlier part of the sentence, namely Mūsā Yabghū, but from the context clearly means Tughril. Might this not allow for the conjecture that two separate sources were not very successfully joined together, the latter one dealing exclusively with the activities of Tughril in the decade just after Dandānqān ?

According to our source, Tughril then received the power of the sultanate and for fifteen years extended the Seljuq lands dividing up all of Khurāsān. We know from the *Maliknāma* that Tughril unofficially took the title sultan (*al-sultān al-mu'azzam*) already after the occupation of Nishāpūr in 429/1038<sup>104</sup>; thus, Mxit'ar's meaning might be construed as fifteen years from the taking of Nishāpūr, that is to say to 445/1053-4, prior to Tughril's entry into Baghdađ which is not alluded to at all by our source. On the other hand, we know from

<sup>102</sup> Cahen, p. 38; Rāwandi mentions him by name, ed. Iqbāl, pp. 108-9, trans. p. 107.

<sup>103</sup> Ed. 'Azzāwi, text p. 49, trans. p. 265. The passage referring to Sarjuq (S.r.j.q.) has been translated into English by D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars* (Princeton, 1954), p. 259; see also Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 220.

<sup>104</sup> *Akhbār*, trans. pp. 6-7; Cahen, p. 62; Bosworth, *Ghaznavids*, p. 267; *idem*, *CHI*, p. 23.

numismatic evidence that Tughril was using the title formally as early as 438/1046-7<sup>105</sup>, allowing for the more likely interpretation of roughly fifteen years from then until Tughril Beg's death in 455/1063. The lands of Khurāsān were parcelled out to the various members of the family : Chaghri was at Marv, Mūsā Yabghū at Herāt, Bust and Sistān, while Ibrāhim Īnal (Tughril's half-brother) and Tughril moved into Iran<sup>106</sup>.

As for finding treasure and sending (it ?) to the caliph, Mxit'ar seems to lump together several events which are separated by nearly a decade. 'Imād al-Din tells us that shortly after Tughril's entry into Ray, 434/1042-3, but before 437/1045-6, he found buried treasure in the province of Daylam<sup>107</sup>. Somewhat later Ibn al-Athīr reports that in 443/1051 Tughril made the final conquest of Iṣfahān, carried off its treasure to Ray, and then sent gifts to the caliph in thanks for the honors that had been bestowed on him<sup>108</sup>. Bar Hebraeus confirms this saying that a large sum was sent just after the caliph had given Tughril the titles « legitimate sovereign » and « Rukn al-Din »<sup>109</sup>. This date seems confirmed by coins of 443/1050-1 from Nishāpūr with the title Rukn al-Din<sup>110</sup>. This latter title was only finally confirmed in person by the Caliph al-Qā'im when he met Tughril for the first time in 449/1058<sup>111</sup>, but it is clear from the testimony of the *Maliknāma*, al-Rāwandi, and the numismatic evidence that the title had been granted earlier<sup>112</sup>. The caliph had also read Tughril's name

<sup>105</sup> « al-sultān al-mu'azzam shāhānshāh Tughril-Beg Abū Tālib », on a *dīnār* from Ray dated 438/1046-7; George C. Miles, *The Numismatic History of Rayy* (New York, 1938), p. 198, no. 226. Furthermore, Nishāpūrī/Rāwandi, p. 105, trans., p. 104, says that *circa* 437/1045-6 the caliph gave Tughril permission to strike coins, though in the context this date seems too early and Iqbal has suggested that it must be read 447/1055-6, see trans., p. 104, n. 1.

<sup>106</sup> Rāwandi, p. 104, trans. pp. 102-3; *Akhbār*, trans. p. 12; Iṣfahānī, p. 8, trans. p. 6.

<sup>107</sup> Iṣfahānī, p. 9, trans. p. 6.

<sup>108</sup> Ibn al-Athīr, IX, pp. 397-8, cf. Miles, *ibid.*, p. 199.

<sup>109</sup> Bar Hebraeus, Turkish trans., I, p. 305.

<sup>110</sup> Miles, *ibid.*

<sup>111</sup> Iṣfahānī, p. 14, trans. p. 11; Bosworth, *CHI*, p. 47; I. Kafesoğlu, article « Selçuklular », *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, X, pp. 366-7 with further references.

<sup>112</sup> On coins of Ray all with Rukn al-Din dated from 442/1050-1 to 453/1062, Miles, p. 199-202, with perhaps one doubtful reading of Rukn al-Dawla for the year 452/1061, p. 202, no. 233. According to al-Rāwandi, already when the caliph's personal emissary Muḥammad al-Ma'mūnī was dispatched to Tughril, al-Qā'im read his name in the *khuṭba*, allowed him to strike coins, and gave him the *laqab* Rukn al-Dawla; ed. Iqbal,

in the *khuṭba* in that same year, but again probably also much earlier <sup>113</sup>. Since Mxit'ar does not mention Tughril's entry into Baghdād in 446/1055 it is difficult to ascertain if the events mentioned in the source he used, e.g. reading of the *khuṭba*, took place before or after that date since there is evidence to support both possibilities.

The use of Rukn al-Dawla instead of Rukn al-Din by Mxit'ar is also interesting and perhaps indicative of the source he had before him. It may indicate his affinity to the Persian tradition of Ẓāhir al-Dīn for it is found in Rāwandi, whereas the *Maliknāma* — the *Akhbār*, Ibn al-Athir, Bar Hebraeus — uses for the most part Rukn al-Din. This distinction in the use of al-Din and al-Dawla between the Persian Ghaznavid sources and the Seljuq ones has recently been stressed by Samuel M. Stern <sup>114</sup>.

The rest of Mxit'ar's narrative on the Seljuqs is an extremely condensed catalogue of the various sultans, starting with Alp-Arslan and continuing through to the last Seljuq of Iraq, Tughril b. Arslanhāh (d. 590/1194), who was still alive while Mxit'ar was writing.

Taking Mxit'ar's history of the early Seljuqs as a whole, it is clear that the locus of events falls within the three decades from 416/1025 to 446/1055. What were his sources for this narrative? In the passage as quoted by Vardan, Mxit'ar does not name any other works or authors; however, in the surviving fragment of his history, after a series of pre-5th/11th century Armenian historians, he names the following: Aristakēs of Lastivert, Kozrān (read Yovhannēs] Sarkawag) and Samuel of Ani (see *supra* n. 18). Neither Aristakēs' *History* nor Samuel's *Chronical* contain much information on early Seljuq history. As to

p. 105, trans. pp. 104-5. Rāwandi places this event some time before 437/1045-6, but see Iqbal's suggested correction, *supra* n. 105; Iṣfahāni puts the embassy just after 437/1045-6, but here again the context is not clear, ed. Houtsma, p. 9, trans. p. 7.

<sup>113</sup> It is reported that after the occupation of Nishāpūr in 429/1038 the *khuṭba* was read in Tughril's name, see Bosworth, *CHI*, p. 23, n. 23 for reference to Bayhaqī, p. 553. Ibn Fundūq reports the same for the city of Bayhaq at about the same time, Cahen, p. 62, n. 71; for Rāwandi's report see the previous note. In 441/1049-50 it was read in Diyārbakr again for Tughril, Bosworth, *ibid.*, p. 45.

<sup>114</sup> In one of the very last articles before his unexpected and much lamented death, Stern said, « It is true that the *dawla* titles are first in chronological appearance; it is only with the Saljūqs that the *dīn* ones become preponderant, although the Ghaznavids continued, on the whole, to favour the older, *dawla* ones »; « A Manuscript from the Library of the Ghaznavid Amir 'Abd al-Rashid », *Paintings from Islamic Lands*, ed. R. Pinder-Wilson (Oxford, 1969), p. 16. See also Bosworth, *CHI*, p. 207, n. 2.

the lost history of Yovhannēs, we know about it by way of the fragments quoted by Samuel and its mention by Vardan and Kirakos of Ganjak. As stated before, the first part covered the history of the Turks through Tughril Beg and Alp-Arslan, while the second part, though mentioning Barkyarug and Tutush, was primarily about Malikshāh. Unfortunately, we have no fragments or quoted passages to compare against Vardan's citation from Mxit'ar. Yet we know from Samuel, and after him Kirakos, that Yovhannēs wrote about « Maḥmūd » (presumably of Ghazna), « Tughril », and « Sarč'uk », with the form of the latter name given by both authors<sup>115</sup>. Mxit'ar too wrote about Maḥmūd, Tughril and Sarč'uk; therefore, in view of this evidence and the reconstruction of the name, it is reasonable to conclude that Mxit'ar had the use of Yovhannēs' history. It must be remembered that we have only this short fragment of the third part of Mxit'ar's work; if the whole were available we might be able to detail more accurately its indebtedness to Yovhannēs or others.

It is clear that in addition to Armenian sources Mxit'ar had access to Muslim ones. This is textually ascertained by the use of *hijra* dates (see *supra* n. 20), foreign words such as *'alam*, *laqab*<sup>116</sup>, *minbar*, *amīr*, and the correct or nearly correct forms of titles, e.g. *Rukn al-Dawla*, *Khalifa*, *Amin al-Dawla*<sup>117</sup>, and proper names. Furthermore, we have the author's own testimony that he could not only read Persian, but that he translated into Armenian from that language (*supra* n. 19).

What were these Muslim sources which Mxit'ar used? It has been conjectured in this study that several different works were utilized; whether they were all Muslim or partially Armenian, or whether Muslim but transmitted through an earlier Armenian source, i.e. Yovhannēs, is not certain. The first part of the excerpt from Mxit'ar, not given in the translation above, which details events through Sultan Maḥmūd's death, seems to have been taken from a purely Ghaznavid source. The second part, which begins with the first line of the passage translated above, commences before Maḥmūd's death and goes on until just after Dandānqān; this also seems to be taken from a Ghaznavid or Baghdādī work, for the only Seljuq mentioned by name is « Ap'aḥu » (Yabghū), i.e. Arslan-Isrā'il. Then a probable

<sup>115</sup> For Samuel, see Zarbanalean, p. 610; Kirakos, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

<sup>116</sup> The Armenian, *lałap*, ed. Venice, p. 94; ed. Emin, p. 127.

<sup>117</sup> The Armenian, *Aminadl*, *ibid.* for both editions.

third source discusses the deeds of Tughril Beg from *circa* 429/1038-431/1040 to shortly before his entry into Baghdād in 446/1055, a fact not mentioned in the account; the opening line of this essentially Tughril oriented source, which calls Mūsā Yabghū the leader of the Turks, may have been added from still another source. A final source, probably Yovhannēs and/or the author's personal experience was used for the succession of the sultans after Tughril.

The details concerning the events from 416/1025 to the battle of Dandānqān were taken from a work written before the mid-6th/12th century (perhaps well before), because Ghazna still belonged to the Ghaznavids (*supra* p. 344). This eliminates the use of such Muslim sources as the *Akhbār al-dawlat al-Saljūqiyya* (at least in its present form), 'Imād al-Din al-Isfahānī and al-Bundārī, probably Nishāpūrī, and certainly al-Rāwandi; of course, later works which used these sources or the *Maliknāma* would also be discounted: Ibn al-Athīr, Bar Hebraeus and Mirkhwānd. As for the *Maliknāma* itself, very little of its pre-Dandānqān narrative corresponds to Mxit'ar's, though in the period just following there are similarities to the versions of Isfahānī and Bar Hebraeus; but the orientation of Mxit'ar's source is very favorable to Tughril, not even mentioning Chaghri except by name only once in the opening line whose association with the rest of the passage is doubtful, whereas, the *Maliknāma*, which was supposedly written for Alp-Arslan, has a bias towards the latter's father, Chaghri Beg.

Mention has been made before of the conjectured, and certainly lost, history of Ibn Ḥassūl. Not only does the author use the form Sarjuq (*S.r.j.q*) in his preserved *Risāla*, but having written this work explicitly for Tughril, he has, like Mxit'ar, a strong bias towards him. In addition, the use of the form Sarč'uk by Yovhannēs may indicate that he too made use of Abū'l 'Alā's supposed history. But here again there is a problem; not only are we not sure of the exact contents of this work, but worse, unlike the *Maliknāma*, it would probably have been written in Arabic and we have no direct evidence that either Mxit'ar or Yovhannēs Sarkawag knew that language. On the other hand, their knowing Arabic should not be discounted, nor should the possibility of still another, unidentified, intermediary source.

For the events surrounding Tughril in the post-Dandānqān period, Mxit'ar has more in common with the Zahīr al-Din group of Persian sources: the insistence on Mūsā Yabghū as head of the family, the

sending of ambassadors by the caliph and his reading of Tughril's name in the *khuṭba*, the use of the form Rukn al-Dawla as opposed to the Rukn al-Din of the *Maliknāma*. Details from earlier passages on the Ghaznavids and the capture of Arslan Yabghū are also similar. Thus it seems that it is in this direction that the ultimate inspiration for Mxit'ar's antecedents must be sought.

In summary, the account of early Seljuq history preserved in the 7th/13th century Armenian historian Vardan is taken directly from the late 6th/12th century writer Mxit'ar of Ani. It is a well informed and well narrated passage, based not on « oral » or « late traditions », but quite the contrary, on a variety of Armenian and Islamic sources, for the most part probably dating from the late 5th/11th and early 6th/12th centuries. Though the account is brief, it is concise and as accurate and free of errors in proportion to its length as any of our other sources.

American University in Cairo.

Dickran K. KOUYMIAN.